AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been

| DOCKET NO. DATE FILED U.S. DISTRICT COURT CV 11-06626 LB 12/23/11 Northern District of California, 1301 Clay St., Rm 400S, Oakland, CA 94612 | filed in the U.S. Di | strict Court Northern Dist | rict of California on the following X Patents or Trademarks: |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| CVI -06626 LB 12/23/11 Northern District of California, 1301 Clay St, Rm. 400S, Oakland, CA 94012 PATENTOR TRADEMARK NO. | | | U.S. DISTRICT COURT |
| PATENT OR TRADEMARK I U OS \$1389 2 U 3 2 U 5 U 5 3 T 2 S T 3 U 5 U 5 In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED DY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK I SEE ATTACHED ATTACHED AMENDMARK SEE ATTACHED DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK I SEE ATTACHED TRADEMARK NO. OR TRADEMARK I SEE ATTACHED CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE DATE DATE CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE DATE TRADEMARK DATE DATE | | 12/23/11 | Northern District of California, 1301 Clay St., Rm 400S, Oakland, CA 94612 |
| PATENT OR TRADEMARK 1 U_0.55 & 389 2 U_0.3 2 U_1 5 U_5 3 T_1.28 T_1.58 U_5 In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK 1 SEE ATTACHED 2 Amendment Answer SEE ATTACHED 2 SEE ATTACHED In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK [BY] DEPUTY CLERK DATE | PLAINTIFF TAGGED INC | | FOTOMEDIA TECHNOLOGIES LLC |
| TRADEMARK NO. OR TRADEMARK 1 Lo SS 389 2 Lo 3 24 S45 3 T 287 O8 8 4 T SST S14 5 REATTACHED In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK OR TRADEMARK 1 SEE ATTACHED 2 SEE ATTACHED 1 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE DATE | IAGGED INC. | | |
| TRADEMARK NO. OR TRADEMARK 1 Lo SS 389 2 Lo 3 24 S45 3 T 287 O8 8 4 T SST S14 5 REATTACHED In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK OR TRADEMARK 1 SEE ATTACHED 2 SEE ATTACHED 1 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE DATE | | | |
| SEE ATTACHED 1 | | | HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK |
| 2 Land the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading | | OK Helbania | SEE ATTACHED |
| 3 1 28 1 08 8 4 1 58 1 514 57 2 4 1 2 10 In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED NCLUDED BY | | | |
| In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK OR TRADEMARK SEE ATTACHED 1 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR OR TRADEMARK OR TRADEMARK SEE ATTACHED 1 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included: DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK I SEE ATTACHED 2 3 4 5 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Coss Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK SEE ATTACHED 1 SEE ATTACHED 1 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK [BY] DEPUTY CLERK DATE | · CCAHARO | ļ | |
| DATE INCLUDED INCLUDED BY Amendment Answer Coss Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK SEE ATTACHED 1 SEE ATTACHED 1 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK [BY] DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| Amendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading PATENT OR TRADEMARK DATE OF PATENT HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK 1 SEE ATTACHED 2 3 | | | ng patent(s) have been included. |
| TRADEMARK NO. OR TRADEMARK SEE ATTACHED SEE ATTACHED In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | DATE INCLUDED | | mendment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading |
| 1 SEE ATTACHED 2 3 | | | HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK |
| 2 3 4 5 5 In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | OR TRADEMINA | SEE ATTACHED |
| 3 | | | |
| In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued: DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | | |
| DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | Ľ | | |
| DECISION/JUDGEMENT CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | and the description of the following | ng decision has been rendered or judgement issued: |
| CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE | | ove-entitied case, the follow | iig decision nas een vinderes o jung |
| CLERK | DECISION/JUDGEMENT | | |
| CLERK | | | |
| CLERK | | | |
| CLERK | | | DATE |
| Richard W. Wieking | | l l | (BY) DEPUTY CLERK |
| - | Richard W | . Wieking | |

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner Copy 4—Case file copy

Nicholas A. Brown (SBN 198210) GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 133 Townsend Street, 8th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94107 Telephone: (415) 655-1300 Facsimile: (415) 707-2010 Email: brownn@gtlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Tagged, Inc.

ORIGINAL

DEC 2 3 2011

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTED W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Tagged, Inc.,

Plaintiff, v.

Fotomedia Technologies, LLC

Defendant.

CASENO.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Complaint Case No.

12

16 17 18

19 20 21

22232425

262728

Plaintiff Tagged Inc.'s ("Tagged") brings this action for declaratory judgment against Defendant Fotomedia Technologies LLC ("Fotomedia") and alleges as follows:

PARTIES

- Tagged is a corporation existing under the laws of Delaware, with a principal place of business at 110 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco, California 94111.
- On information and belief, defendant FotoMedia is a Delaware limited liability company having a place of business at 155 Fleet Street, Portsmouth, New Hampshire 03801.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Jurisdiction

- 3. This is a declaratory judgment action for patent non-infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35, United States Code, Section 100 et seq. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this controversy pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201, and 2202.
- 4. An actual, substantial and continuing justiciable controversy exists between Tagged and Fotomedia based on Fotomedia having previously filed a complaint for patent infringement against Tagged and other defendants in the action titled Fotomedia Technologies LLC v. Facebook Inc. et al., United States District Court for the District of Delaware, Civil Action No. 1:11-ev-00826-MMB (the "Facebook Action"). In the Facebook Action, Fotomedia alleged that Tagged infringed U.S. Patent Nos. 6,058,399 ("the '399 patent"), 6,324,545 ("the '545 patent"), 7,287,088 ("the '088 patent"), 7,587,514 ("the '514 patent"); and RE41,210 ("the '210 patent") (collectively, the "Facebook Action Patents"). Copies of these patents are attached hereto as exhibits A through E.
- On December 22, 2011, Fotomedia dismissed the Facebook Action with respect to Tagged. The dismissal was without prejudice.
- Fotomedia did not provide any explanation for the dismissal, and Fotomedia and Tagged have not reached a resolution of the dispute created by Fotomedia's initiation of the Facebook Action against Tagged.

25 26

23

24

27 28 Tagged requires a declaration by this Court of its rights with respect to Fotomedia's allegations that Tagged infringed the Facebook Action Patents.

This Court has personal jurisdiction over Fotomedia based on Fotomedia's presence in California and continuous and systematic contacts with California. On information and belief, Fotomedia-both directly and through its parent company, Scenera Research LLChas been pursuing licensing activities and enforcement activities in California and, specifically, in the Northern District of California, since at least 2007. In 2007 Fotomedia asserted a number of patents, including patents related to one of the patents Fotomedia asserted in the Facebook Action, against several companies that are located in the Northern District of California, including for example Yahoo! Inc., and Shutterfly, Inc. Fotomedia's assertion of patents against companies that are located in the Northern District of California is shown, for example, by the proceedings and records in two cases filed in the Eastern District of Texas, Case Nos. 2:07-cv-00255 and 2:07-cv-00256. Fotomedia's assertion of patents against companies that are located in the Northern District of California is also shown by the Facebook Action. Upon information and belief, Fotomedia has met, attempted to do business with, and/or done business with, including in some instances by reaching patent licensing arrangements with, companies that are located in the Northern District of California, including Yahoo! Inc., Shutterfly Inc., Facebook Inc., and Tagged.

Venue

(c).

Venue is proper within this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and

Intradistrict Assignment

10. This action arises in San Francisco County because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in San Francisco County. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2, the action is properly assigned to the San Francisco Division of the Northern District of California

Complaint 3 Case No.

13

27 28

Apple repeats and re-alleges each and every allegation of paragraphs 1 through 11. 10 above, and incorporates them by reference as if fully set forth herein.

On information and belief, Fotomedia claims to be the owner of all right, title and 12. interest in the '399 patent, the '545 patent, the '088 patent, the '514 patent, and the '210 patent.

- 13 Fotomedia previously filed a complaint in the Facebook Action against Tagged alleging that Tagged directly infringed and/or induced infringement and/or contributed to the infringement of the '399 patent, the '545 patent, the '088 patent, the '514 patent, and the '210 patent.
- Tagged has not directly infringed, induced infringement, or contributed to the infringement of any valid claims of the '399 patent, the '545 patent, the '088 patent, the '514 patent, and the '210 patent.
- 15. An actual case or controversy exists between Tagged and Fotomedia based on Fotomedia's previously-filed complaint against Tagged in the Facebook Action.
- 16 Tagged has been injured and damaged by Fotomedia's accusations of infringement.
- 17. Declaratory relief is appropriate and necessary to establish that Tagged has not directly or indirectly infringed any valid claims of the '399 patent, the '545 patent, the '088 patent, the '514 patent, or the '210 patent.
- 18. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, et seq., Tagged requests a declaratory judgment that it does not infringe any valid claims of the '399 patent, the '545 patent, the '088 patent, the '514 patent, or the '210 patent.

RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Tagged hereby requests that this Court:

Render judgment declaring that Tagged has not infringed, and is not infringing. a. any valid claims of the '399 patent, the '545 patent, the '088 patent, the '514 patent, or the '210 patent, either directly or indirectly, and either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

| 3 | c. Award Tagged such other and additional relief as this Court deems just and | | | | |
|----|---|---|--------|--|--|
| 4 | proper. | | | | |
| 5 | JURY DEMAND | | | | |
| 6 | Tagged, Inc. requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable. | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | Dated: December 23, 2011 | Respectfully submitted, | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | By: | | | |
| 11 | | Nicholas A. Brown (SBN 198210) GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP | | | |
| 12 | | 153 Townsend Street, 8th Floor San Francisco, California 94107 | | | |
| 13 | | San Francisco, California 94107 Tel. (415) 655-1300 Fax. (415) 707-2010 brownn@gtlaw.com | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | Attorneys for Plaintiff, Tagged Inc. | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | ha and | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | 10 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | J. | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| | Complaint | 5 Case No. | | | |
| | M. 177 | S Case No | | | |

Award Tagged its fees and costs, including attorneys fees, pursuant to 35 U.S.C.

b. § 285; and